

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P O Box 1450 Alexandra, Virginia 22313-1450 www.weylo.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/773,507	02/05/2004	Taejoon Kwon	YPL0080US	6812	
23413 7590 03/12/2009 CANTOR COLBURN, LLP			EXAMINER		
20 Church Stre			ZHOU, SHUBO		
	22nd Floor Hartford, CT 06103		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
manora, er o	.0105		1631		
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			03/12/2009	ELECTRONIC	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

usptopatentmail@cantorcolburn.com

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/773,507	KWON, TAEJOON	
Examiner	Art Unit	
SHUBO (Joe) ZHOU	1631	

	SHUBO (Joe) ZHOU	1631	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the o	correspondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED 11 February 2009 FAILS TO PLACE THIS	APPLICATION IN CONDITION FO	R ALLOWANCE.	
 M The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following i application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appe for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods: 	the same day as filing a Notice of eplies: (1) an amendment, affidavi al (with appeal fee) in compliance	Appeal. To avoid abar t, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing	date of the final rejection.		
b) A The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Ar no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (I MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f	ter than SIX MONTHS from the mailing	date of the final rejection	n.
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1,138(a). The date have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period red valued red 77 CFR 1,17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any pely received by the Office may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1,704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	ension and the corresponding amount hortened statutory period for reply origi	of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Office	ate extension fee e action; or (2) as
 The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in compl filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed wi 	sion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the	
AMENDMENTS	A service to the state of Charles being		
 The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, be (a) They raise new issues that would require further core (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below 	sideration and/or search (see NO) v);	ΓE below);	
(c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in bett appeal; and/or			ne issues for
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a c NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).	orresponding number of finally reje	ected claims.	
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12	1. See attached Notice of Non-Co	mpliant Amendment (I	PTOL-324).
 Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): 			
 Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s). 	owable if submitted in a separate,	timely filed amendmer	t canceling the
7. \(\subseteq \text{ for purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s); a) [I how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prov The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed to \(\frac{1.2.4.7.9.12 \text{ and } 15. \)		I be entered and an e	xplanation of
Claim(s) rejected: 1.2.4-7.9-12 and 15. Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:			
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE			
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 			
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to or showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary 	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea	al and/or appellant fail:	s to provide a
 The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER 	n of the status of the claims after er	ntry is below or attach	ed.
11. 🛮 The request for reconsideration has been considered but	does NOT place the application in	condition for allowan	ce because:
12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (13. Other:	PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)		
	/SHUBO (Joe) ZHOU/ Primary Examiner, Art U	nit 1631	

Continuation of 11:

The amended independent claims 1, 7, and 12 are objected to because each thereof contains two periods at the end. Their independent claims are objected to for being dependent therefrom.

Regarding the rejection of claims 1-2, 4-7, 9-12, 15 under 35 USC 103(a), applicants arguments have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. The argument is mainly on the ground that Benson et al. is silent with respect to at least a local estimation unit, and the Office fails to provide evidence documenting that Benson does in fact disclose a unit performing elements of determining a reference group, etc. See page 9 of 11 of the response filed 211/109. In summary, the arguments are focused on that Benson does not disclose the "unit" for performing the functions recited in the claims. This is not found persuasive. With regard to the location estimation unit, as set forth in the previous Office action, mailed 12/12/08, on page 4, Benson et al. disclose displaying the location of the querylarget sequence in the various database record sequences in the form of alignments, It would have been readily apparent and/or obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art that in order to display the locations, the GenBank system disclosed by Benson et al. must have contained a unit to determine or at least estimate the locations. As to applicant's assertion that the Office affice should be devidence that Benson disclose a unit performing the claimed elements, it is found unpersuasive because while the Office does not disjoute that Benson does not explicitly disclose these units, as so stated in the previous Office action, the Office indicated that Benson discloses the related functions performed. Again, it has been the Office's position that if the GenBank system disclosed by Benson et al. performs a particular function, it would have been readily apparent and/or obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art that the system must have contained a unit performing such a function.